

18
STATEMENT OF FACTS,

RELATIVE TO

THE ORIGIN AND CAUSES

OF

THE PRESENT ATTEMPT

TO FREE

THE SCHUYLKILL PERMANENT BRIDGE.

STATEMENT, &c.

THE President, Directors and Company for erecting a Permanent Bridge over the River Schuylkill at or near the City of Philadelphia, were incorporated under an act of Assembly passed the 16th March, 1798.

On the 28th of March, 1800, the city of Philadelphia conveyed to the bridge company the present site of the permanent bridge, with all its appurtenances and privileges, for which they received the sum of \$40,000.

The bridge erected on this site, consisted of two abutments, two piers, and three arches. The first stone of the eastern pier was laid September 5, 1801. That of the western pier, December 25, 1802.

The bridge was declared open for passengers and transportation, on the 1st day of January, 1805, and the cover was begun and finished in the same year.

The eastern abutment, eighteen feet thick, and its wings, are founded on the rock. The western abutment, of equal thickness, and its wings, are built on a platform supported by piles. The eastern pier was erected in a depth of water from twenty-one to twenty-four feet, in a coffer dam. The lower course of masonry is bolted on the rock. The western pier, attended with greater difficulties, constant hazard, and unavoidable expense, was commenced in the midst of an inclement winter, within a coffer dam of original and appropriate construction, in which 800,000 feet of timber were employed. The depth of the water from the rock is forty-one feet. No pier of regular masonry, in so great a depth of water, was then known to exist in any other part of the world. The masonry of this pier was begun on Christmas day, 1802, and erected from the rock to low water mark, in forty-one days and nights, after seven months had been occupied in preparing the dam and retrieving its misfortunes. These piers are in length seventy-one feet six inches, battering to the top, where they are in length sixty feet ten inches, and in thickness nineteen feet four inches. The height of the eastern pier from the rock is forty feet, and that of the western pier is fifty-five feet nine inches.

This bridge cost, including the purchase of the site, \$300,000.

The *coffer dams*, foundations, and other subaqueous works, consumed a great proportion of the expenditures.

The capital stock of the company is \$ 195,650.
 The difference between that and the actual cost of the bridge is 104,350

Whole cost, \$ 300,000

This difference or debt was liquidated by applying the whole of the income of the company for several years to its payment. The effect of this was, that from the commencement of the bridge until the year 1812, inclusive, only two dividends, amounting together to five and a half per cent., were declared and paid to the stockholders, who had so meritoriously contributed their funds towards the erection of this great and valuable public work, and that during the whole period of twenty-nine years, from the opening of the bridge on the 1st of January, 1805, they have received but \$ 5 56 $\frac{2}{9}$ per cent. on the capital stock of \$ 195,650, and if the preceding years, from 1800 to 1805, when the expenditures were made, are added, it will decrease the rate of interest received still more.

The individuals, therefore, who, unaided by the public treasure, undertook and accomplished this new and hazardous enterprise, by a liberal expenditure of their money, their labour, and their time, were public benefactors, and were always so regarded by the community of which they were most valuable and respectable members; and they and their successors are unquestionably entitled to every indulgence from their fellow-citizens, who have enjoyed the benefits derived from this great public improvement.

It was in this light that the bridge company were universally regarded by the community at large, and they were not only not molested in the lawful exercise of their franchises and rights, but received their full share of the public approbation, for the convenience of their structure and the adaptation of all their arrangements towards securing an easy and uninterrupted passage across the Schuylkill.

The first symptom of hostility to this bridge, was evinced during the session of 1828—29, and as a short history of some of the transactions of those and the succeeding years, will in a great measure elucidate the causes of the present attempt to appraise the Permanent Bridge, it may not be uninteresting to enter into a short detail of them.

Under the act of the 28th March, 1828, the board of canal commissioners, with the approbation of their engineer, located the Pennsylvania Railway “to the station marked for an inclined plane, near the residence of the late Judge Peters, on the Schuylkill river, thence *by bridge* across the Schuylkill, and by the line of the old Union Canal, to the corner of Broad and Callowhill streets, and thence along the middle of Broad street, until it crosses the line of the city of Philadelphia.” This location received the written consent of the governor, and of course became the line established by law.

On the 6th January, 1829, the following resolution, accompanied by a preamble, was twice read, considered, and adopted by the senate:

“Be it resolved, that the committee on roads, bridges, and inland navigation, be instructed to inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill, giving to the said commissioners authority to construct the rail road from the stationary engine near Judge Peters’s farm, to some point on the Schuylkill, affording a complete communication with the ocean, following the western side of the river, and leaving to the community the option of crossing at the said point, or at some other point between the upper bridge and Market street, by means of bridges, to be constructed by companies to be duly constituted by law.”

Upon the passage of this resolution, a speech was delivered by one of the senators from the city of Philadelphia (which was afterwards published in an authentic shape in pamphlet form,) urging a location on the west bank of the Schuylkill, and arguing most strenuously against the propriety of carrying the original line of rail road by its present convenient location through Broad street.

To this speech were annexed several certificates, and amongst others, an extract from a letter from Canvass White, dated 17th December, 1828, in which, without ever having surveyed the ground for a bridge at Arch street, he gives as an estimate for a bridge with three piers and two abutments, making 700 feet of superstructure, at that spot, the inconceivably low estimate of \$63,500.

On the 11th January, 1829, the committee on roads, bridges, and inland navigation, in pursuance of this reference, reported resolution No. 41, entitled “Resolution relative to the Pennsylvania Rail Road,” which after various amendments finally passed both houses, and was approved by the governor on the 20th April, 1829.

This resolution is as follows:—

“Be it resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in General Assembly met, That the Canal Commissioners be, and they are hereby authorized, to make or cause to be made a re-examination and survey of the line of the Pennsylvania Rail Road, commencing at the foot of the contemplated inclined plane near the farm of the late Judge Peters, and terminating at Broad and Vine streets, at the City of Philadelphia; and also to cause examinations to be made from the said inclined plane to such other point on the line of the City; and also to such point on the tide waters of the Schuylkill, at the head of the sloop navigation, as they may deem expedient, and also to make an estimate of the cost of construction, and to ascertain the amount of damages to private property, as far as practicable, on the respective routes, and such other routes as they may deem expedient to survey, and make report to the next Legislature, and also whether, in their opinion, it will be the interest of the State to make more than one line of Rail Road from said Peters’s farm, and if so, which; *and in the mean time not to contract for the construction of any Rail Road, east of the contemplated inclined plane, beyond Judge Peters’s farm.*”

During this session of the Legislature an act was asked for, incorporating a company for erecting a bridge over the River Schuylkill at Philadelphia, between Market and Vine streets. Against the erection of such a bridge, the Permanent Bridge Company remonstrated, and

accompanied their memorial with estimates of the cost of a bridge erected at or between Arch and Vine streets, made by a person practically acquainted with the subject. In this memorial the following language is used. "A bridge constructed for a railway and common passage, extending from shore to shore, would cost in the whole \$241,887 50. If it should be deemed advisable to limit the bridge to the width of the river or waterway, then it would be necessary to build earthen embankments on the western side, extending from the foot of the bridge to fast land. A bridge constructed upon this plan would be subject to many risks and casualties beyond that before mentioned, and would at the lowest estimate cost \$140,000."

So deeply impressed were the Board of Wardens of the Port of Philadelphia with the impropriety of such a measure, that on the 14th March, 1829, they passed the following resolution, which was forwarded to Harrisburg.

"Resolved, That this board are of opinion that any obstruction in the river by piers, in a time of freshet would be destructive of a great amount of property above the same; and might injuriously affect that valuable improvement, the water works. They therefore hope, if the Legislature grant the liberty of erecting a bridge, they will confine it to be one of one arch, and the abutments not to go further into the river than low water mark."

In pursuance of additional instructions from the Board of Canal Commissioners of the 2d and 14th January and 7th February, 1829, Messrs. Robinson, Hopkins, and Wilson made additional examinations, which ended in their reporting against the line crossing by a bridge at Fair Mount, against a line on the west bank of the Schuylkill, and particularly against any attempt to cross the river by *a bridge* between the Upper Ferry bridge and the bridge at Market street.

In pursuance of the resolution of the 20th April, 1829, Major Douglass was directed by the canal commissioners to survey and examine all the different routes. His report was in favour of the original location with a branch down the east side of the Schuylkill, against the Fair Mount line, against any line beginning west of the inclined plane at Peters's, and most decidedly against crossing by *a bridge* below the Upper Ferry bridge. His estimate for a bridge at Race street was \$130,372, certainly a very low calculation for an erection in tide water.

The canal commissioners, however, reported in favour of crossing at Fair Mount with a single line down the east bank of the Schuylkill. This was most strenuously remonstrated against by the Select and Common Councils of the City of Philadelphia, in which they were supported by their fellow-citizens, both in town meeting, and by numerous memorials presented to the Legislature.

On the 1st February, 1830, another town meeting was held under the following call.

"TOWN MEETING.—The Citizens of the City of Philadelphia, who would prefer that the Pennsylvania Rail Road should cross upon the piers of the bridge, at Market street, (BY AN EQUITABLE ARRANGEMENT WITH THE PROPRIETORS,) and thus preserve

to the City its accustomed traffic, and place the Northern and Southern Districts upon an equal footing; instead of making the Northern Liberties, by means of the Peters's Island route, *the great avenue and depot of our Western trade*, are requested to meet at the Court House, at the corner of Sixth and Chestnut streets, on Monday, the 1st of February next, at three o'clock in the afternoon."

This meeting passed resolutions in favour of a route on the west bank of the Schuylkill, crossing "at or near" the site of the present Permanent Bridge.

The deputations from the different town meetings were heard before the committee on inland navigation and internal improvement, who reported a preamble and resolutions which were laid on the table and never acted upon.

As it was proposed to use the Permanent Bridge for railway purposes, according to the plan of the town meeting of the 1st February, the board of directors submitted the whole question to Messrs. Erdman, Graff, and Major Wilson, who all concurred in opinion that the plan proposed would not only be highly injurious to the safety of the bridge, but that it would not answer the purpose for which it was designed.

The route by Market street was therefore also abandoned, and another attempt was made to incorporate a company to erect a bridge over the River Schuylkill above Market street Permanent Bridge, within the limits of the City of Philadelphia.

The Permanent Bridge Company remonstrated not only against any alteration in the present structure of their bridge, but also against the erection of any bridge between the Permanent Bridge and Upper Ferry Bridge, whether intended for rail road or any other purposes.

In this they were supported by the Select and Common Councils of Philadelphia, the Commissioners of the District of Spring Garden, and the Commissioners of the Northern Liberties, who all presented remonstrances against the erection of any bridge between the Upper Ferry Bridge and the Permanent Bridge at Market street.

It being therefore clear, that public opinion was decidedly in favour of the route by Peters's Island, and against using the Market street Bridge, and the erection of any other bridge, the interests of the west bank of the Schuylkill no longer found supporters in the city and districts, and accordingly at the ensuing session of the legislature, by the act to continue the improvement of the state by canals and rail roads, passed the 21st of March 1831, the original location, crossing at Peters's Island, by a bridge, was adopted, and the canal commissioners were directed to complete the whole of the Pennsylvania rail road as soon as practicable.

Upwards of two valuable years were lost by these attempts to favour the west side of the Schuylkill, and the delay has been deeply injurious, not only to the city and the adjoining districts, but to the state at large, who would ere this have reaped large sums from the tolls and trade on this noble state improvement.

During the same session, an act was passed incorporating a company to make a canal round the western abutment of the Permanent Bridge,

which work is now in the course of execution, and finally settles the question that no other bridge will be erected across the Schuylkill between the Upper and Lower Ferry bridges.

On the 23d March 1832, a motion was made in the house of representatives by Mr. Heston, and read, as follows, viz. —“Resolved by the senate and house of representatives of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania in general assembly met, that the governor be and he is hereby authorized and required to appoint five disinterested and competent persons as commissioners, whose duty it shall be to make a fair survey and estimate of the value of the Schuylkill Permanent Bridge at Market street, agreeably to the provisions of an act passed the 16th day of March 1798, entitled an act to authorize the governor of this commonwealth to incorporate a company for erecting a permanent bridge over the river Schuylkill at or near the city of Philadelphia, and that the said commissioners shall be required to make report to the governor of this commonwealth, to be by him laid before the next legislature.”

On the 24th of March, this resolution was in committee of the whole, and on Monday the 26th of March, it passed a second reading and was sent to the senate for concurrence.

This resolution was thus presented and hurried through the house of representatives near the close of the session, without any notice whatever to the bridge company, or its being understood by the members that it involved the very important question of freeing this bridge at the expense of the state, and that it was also not in accordance with the provisions of the charter.

Upon learning that such a resolution was before the senate, the bridge company took immediate measures to place the matter in its proper light, and so firmly impressed were the members of the senate with the impropriety and inexpediency of the resolution, that on the 7th of April 1832, it was negatived in that body by the very decisive vote of 19 to 6.

This resolution purported to be founded on the provisions of the 10th section of the Act of the 16th March 1798, which provides “that when a good and complete bridge is erected over the said river Schuylkill at or near the city of Philadelphia, at the place deemed most convenient as hereinafter mentioned, the property of the said bridge shall be vested in the said president, directors and company, and their successors, during and unto the end of twenty-five years, to commence from the time when the bridge is completed.” Then, after prescribing the rates of toll, which are exceedingly low, and “which are so regulated that no more than three-fourths of the tolls demandable in other cases shall be taken for the transportation of the produce of the country, and for those laden with manure, half toll; empty carriages of burden to pass for half toll,”—and also prohibiting the erection of the bridge without the consent of the owners of the ground on each side of, and contiguous to the said river, where the said bridge may be erected, the said section proceeds as follows: “And when the said tolls shall exceed 15 per cent. net annual profit, the excess shall compose a fund for the redemption of the bridge so as to render it free, save that there

shall always be a small toll or other revenue for keeping it in repair; this excess shall be laid out in bridge stock or other productive funds, and the dividends of annual product shall be also added to this fund; and all private donations for freeing the bridge shall also be received and invested in like manner; but if by the operation of the fund herein proposed, there shall be a sufficient sum to free the bridge at a period less than the said twenty-five years, then it shall be redeemed and become free on the stockholders being paid the appraised value thereof, and of the profits thereof for the residue of the said term of twenty-five years, which may then be unexpired;

“and if the said fund shall not be adequate to the purpose last mentioned, the legislature may, at the expiration of the said twenty-five years, *declare* it a free bridge, (providing at the same time the means of keeping it in repair) and the company shall be obliged to take such sum of money therefor as shall be allowed on a fair appraisement by indifferent persons;

“the like appraisement shall take place when the Sinking Fund is adequate to the redemption of the bridge, and the establishment of a revenue, if a toll be thought not more eligible for keeping the bridge in repair; but if the said bridge shall not be redeemed and paid for as a free bridge before or at the expiration of the said term of twenty-five years, the said corporation may and shall continue to hold the same on the terms of this act beyond the said term, and until the same shall be redeemed and paid for in manner herein directed.”

This section evidently contemplates three distinct periods for freeing this bridge. The first is before the expiration of the twenty-five years from the completion of the bridge, and depended upon the formation of a fund to be composed of the excess of tolls above 15 per cent. net annual profit, and of private donations for freeing the bridge. If this fund should be sufficient at a period less than twenty-five years, then it was to become free on paying the stockholders the appraised value thereof, and of the profits thereof for the residue of the said term of twenty-five years.

No one of the events here contemplated has ever taken place, for the net annual profits of tolls never has reached any thing like the 15 per cent. specified, and no private donations have ever been received for freeing the bridge. There therefore never has been such a fund as was contemplated by this part of the 10th section, and the legislature of 1798 were entirely mistaken as to the rate of profit to be derived from this work.

The second is at the expiration of the twenty-five years, when the legislature has the power to declare it a *free bridge*, providing at the same time the means of keeping it in repair, and providing also for the payment of such sum of money as shall be allowed for the said bridge, on a fair appraisement by indifferent persons; that is, by disinterested persons mutually selected by the parties.

All these acts are to be cotemporaneous, and the effect produced would be to make the Permanent Bridge at Market street a “*free bridge*,” on which no toll could be levied, even for the purpose of keeping it in repair, which must be provided for from some other source.

The right to have it a *free bridge*, if taken by the Commonwealth under this section, is one shared by all the citizens of the state, and formed a part of the original consideration on which this charter was granted, and cannot be impaired by any subsequent legislative act.

If, therefore, the Legislature deem it expedient to use this part of the 10th section, they must make it a *free bridge*, that is, one on which *no toll*, however small, can be exacted. They must pay its value—and they must provide a fund or means for keeping it in repair.

The third is after the expiration of the twenty-five years, when the Sinking Fund (that is the fund formed by the excess above 15 per cent. net annual profit and by private donations) is adequate to the redemption of the bridge and the establishment of a revenue, if a toll be not thought more eligible for keeping the bridge in repair.

The resolution of Mr. Heston proposed only a survey and estimate of the value of the bridge by five commissioners to be appointed by the Governor—It did not declare it a free bridge, providing at the same time the means of keeping it in repair, and providing also for the payment of such sum of money as shall be allowed for the said bridge, on a fair appraisement by disinterested persons, nor did it provide that the valuation placed upon it by the commissioners should be binding both on the state and the company ; and in all these different particulars it was unquestionably not only contrary to the express requisition of the charter, but also to the spirit of the constitutional provision by which private property is taken and applied to the public use.

The only effect of such a resolution would have been to injure the owners of the bridge by an improper and illegal violation of their private property.

This indirect method of attacking the Bridge Company having failed, it was deemed proper in the next place to bring the subject before the Councils of the City of Philadelphia, and if possible to induce them to undertake the freeing of this bridge for the benefit of the holders of property on the west bank of the Schuylkill, by adding another large item to their enormous city debt, and permanently increasing the heavy burden of city taxation.

A joint committee of councils was accordingly appointed, who requested a conference with the Directors of the Bridge Company, and on the 26th December 1832, were accordingly attended by a committee of the Board, to whom they proposed certain questions.—These questions were answered fully and in detail by the committee, and were afterwards published for the information of the public.

On the 6th March 1832, Mr. Groves, as the chairman of the committee of councils, made a report to the Select Council, which was ordered to be printed.

In this report the committee use the following language, “your committee have selected that part of the report of the Board of Directors, with the view of showing what might be the probable expense of making the bridge free, from which it will appear, that if that mode of ascertaining the value of the bridge be adopted which produces the smallest sum (\$264,127 50) *and if the City were empowered by the act of Assembly, under which the Bridge Company held their charter,*

to make it a free bridge, the sum required for that purpose would be too large to be taken from the funds of the City in the present state of the finances."

"The ONLY MEANS which your committee are aware of for accomplishing this desirable object, is by a direct application to the state legislature, requesting that body to take the necessary measures for making it a free bridge, and as the state has reserved this right, and there can be no doubt but the legislature who passed the act incorporating the company, intended the right should be exercised at the time therein mentioned, your committee can see NO IMPROPRIETY in councils adopting the following resolutions, which they recommend to their consideration :—

"1st. Resolved, that it is expedient that the Schuylkill Permanent Bridge be made a free bridge.

"2d. Resolved, that the legislature of this state be requested to take the necessary measures for providing for the appointment of such number of disinterested persons as they may think proper, to appraise the said bridge, and determine the value thereof agreeably to the provisions of an act, entitled, 'An Act to authorize the Governor of this Commonwealth to incorporate a company for erecting a Permanent Bridge over the River Schuylkill at or near the City of Philadelphia, approved March 16th 1798.'

"3d. Resolved, that a copy of the foregoing resolutions be signed by the Presidents of the Select and Common Councils, and forwarded by them to the speaker of the Senate and speaker of the House of Representatives, requesting them to lay the same before the bodies of the legislature over which they respectively preside."

This report and resolutions were laid on the table and were not acted upon by the last councils.

On the 19th November 1833, Mr. Groves offered the same resolutions in the Select Council, which, after a slight change of phraseology, were adopted on the 19th December 1833, and are those which accompany the memorial presented by them to the legislature.

The city of Philadelphia have therefore *distinctly refused to free this bridge* at the expense of their own citizens, and in so doing have directly defeated the wishes of the owners of property on the west bank of the Schuylkill, who would thus have reaped the whole benefit resulting from an entirely free access into the city and districts, without sharing any part of the burthen, which must have been imposed upon the city, or subjecting their large domains across the river to either an increased debt, or an increased rate of taxation.

The committee of councils indeed stated a plain but wholesome truth, when they declared that the sum required to free this bridge, "*would be too large to be taken from the funds of the city in the present state of THE FINANCES.*"

The councils, however, seem to have fallen into the same error with Mr. Heston, in regard to their second resolution, for it asks simply for the appointment of commissioners "to appraise the said bridge, and determine the value thereof," without taking any notice of the other requisitions of the charter, which are absolutely necessary to be

observed, in order to make such an appraisement legal and binding upon both parties. It seems indeed to have been copied from the resolution which was negatived by so large a vote in the senate in April 1832, and entirely avoids presenting to the legislature the question in its true shape—which is—*that the state shall make this a free bridge at the expense of the Commonwealth, who are not only to pay the full value of this property, but also to provide the means of keeping this wooden bridge in repair for ever.*

On the 12th December 1833, a call for a town meeting signed by a number of respectable citizens, appeared in some of the newspapers of the city, in the following terms.

“The undersigned invite such of their fellow-citizens as are disposed to cause the Schuylkill Permanent Bridge to be made free, by an equitable arrangement with the company, in strict accordance with their charter, to meet at the County Court house, on Friday the 27th instant, at 3½ o’clock P. M.”

Several resolutions were passed by this meeting, and a committee of correspondence of thirty-one individuals was appointed.

A portion of this committee has published and circulated an address to the public, which concludes with the following paragraph.

“The committee but ask the legislature to cause this bridge **TO BE APPRAISED** in conformity with the law, and they trust that the upper and lower bridges will be made free.”

As this report or address, no doubt, contains all the arguments in favour of the proposed measure that can be urged by its warmest friends, a brief examination of them, with the call under which the town meeting was held, will enable not only the citizens of Philadelphia and the adjoining districts, but those of the state at large, to understand from what quarter this proposition really emanates, and also to ascertain how far it ought to be countenanced in *the present state of the finances of the City, County, Districts, and State.*

The notice for the town meeting would appear to have contemplated an equitable arrangement with the company, which ordinary persons might suppose to mean a fair and liberal payment to the stockholders of the real value of their property, and in that light it must have been viewed by the citizens signing the call. **THE ADDRESS HOWEVER DISCLOSES A VERY DIFFERENT VIEW OF THE CASE, AND IT IS THE EVIDENT ATTEMPT OF THAT PAPER TO DEPRECIATE THE VALUE OF THE BRIDGE, TO INJURE THE PROPERTY OF ITS NUMEROUS STOCKHOLDERS, AND TO EXCITE PREJUDICES AGAINST THE COMPANY BY A DISTORTION AND MISREPRESENTATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THEIR CHARTER AND BY-LAWS.**

The language of the call is however in singular coincidence with that for the town meeting of the 1st of February 1830, which advocated the interests of the west bank of the Schuylkill; then it was to be (“by an equitable arrangement with the proprietors,”) now, “by an equitable arrangement with the company.”

The address commences with the mode proposed by the committee

in which the bridge shall be valued, and in so doing, unintentionally no doubt, mistakes what was said by the committee of directors of the bridge company, in their answers to the committee of councils.

“2d. As to the value of the bridge,” say the committee of the bridge company, “there may be different modes adopted by different persons, in ascertaining the present value of the bridge, but the committee are of opinion, that, as there has been no depreciation in its value since its erection, the original cost of the structure, and site which was purchased from the City in the year 1800, would be the fairest criterion—

And this would give the sum of \$ 300,000

“4th. Such annual expenses for lighting, watching, superintendence and repairs, &c., as would fall on the State, if taken for a free bridge.

Two watchmen’s salaries and gratuities, \$ 640 00

One superintendent at least, 500 00

Lighting, say oil, 232 10

Repairs, taken from an average of four years, viz. 1829,
1830, 1831, and 1832, 3608 21

Total, \$ 4980 31

“Two watchmen would be necessary; for the two collectors and watchman at present, make together, three; and a capable superintendent to examine the structure almost daily, and superintend the necessary repairs, &c., could not be obtained for the sum above stated.”

“The Committee, having thus answered the questions put to them, beg leave to subjoin a few observations.

“From the above information it is evident, that it will require, to make this a free bridge:—

1st. To pay for it the sum of \$ 300,000

2d. To provide for keeping it in repair, say \$5,000 per annum, equal to a capital of 100,000

3d. In case of any sudden accident by fire or flood, to rebuild it—and if this be only putting up the superstructure, will add from \$ 30,000 to 50,000

“TO PAY THIS MONEY, OR EVEN TO CONTRIBUTE TOWARDS IT, IT IS CERTAIN THAT THE STATE WILL NOT AGREE; FOR IT IS NOT THEIR INTEREST TO RAISE BY TAX FROM THE WHOLE COMMUNITY, THAT WHICH IS NOW PAID IN THE SHAPE OF TOLLS BY THOSE WHO USE THE BRIDGE AND ARE BENEFITED BY IT.

“IF SUCH A RULE WERE ADOPTED, THE PRINCIPLE WOULD EXTEND TO ALL THE WORKS OF INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT OWNED BY THE STATE, WHICH WOULD THUS BE MADE TOLL FREE AT THE EXPENSE OF ALL THE DIFFERENT SECTIONS OF THE COMMONWEALTH.

“A tax by tolls has always been considered the most equitable form of taxation, as none contribute towards the support of the improvement except those who have the actual use of it.”

From these extracts it is evident that the bridge company always considered the original cost of the structure and site as the method

by which they thought the valuation should be made, and not by taking the market value of the stock, which was only presented for the purpose of showing to councils what that mode of estimation would produce.

“The company” never did, therefore, as alleged by the address, “contend that their stock is to determine by its market value the sum which they are to receive”—which might place them at the mercy of any individual, who, at the time of the appraisement, might, by false representations or unfounded attacks, create a fictitious depression for his own ends.

The address then says “the appraisers would be required under the law to ascertain the cost of constructing precisely a similar bridge, and to deduct therefrom the depreciation in value occasioned by the waste of time, and give credit to the company for the present value of the site on which the bridge is placed.”

Now there are no such words in the charter, and it might be answered with perfect safety, that no such mode of valuation is pointed out by that instrument.

But let us for a moment take this mode of valuation according to the views presented by the address, and see what it will produce.

“To ascertain the cost of constructing precisely a similar bridge,” of course on the same site, it would certainly be the most simple and correct method to take what it actually did cost, viz. \$ 260,000 and about this there can be no mistake—for it is not a question of estimate and theory, but merely of the result of actual experiment.

Then “deduct therefrom the depreciation in value occasioned by the waste of time.” Now as there can be no doubt that all the substantial parts of the bridge, such as piers, abutments, and foundations, are more solid than they were when first erected, and as the committee in their note appear to think the whole bridge “to be now as good as new,” it is perfectly clear that no such depreciation in value has taken place, and of course that the original cost is the fairest test of value under this mode of valuation.

But even allowing, for the sake of argument, some depreciation by the waste of time, the committee are willing still “to give credit to the company for the *present value* of the site on which the bridge is placed.”

Now this site in 1800 (*thirty-four years ago*,) cost \$ 40,000, that of course was its value then.

It certainly cannot have decreased in value since that period. The city of Philadelphia alone numbers more inhabitants now than did the whole city and county of Philadelphia in the year 1800. The amount of tolls has increased largely since the year 1805, when the bridge was first opened. All the principal roads on the west side of the Schuylkill, now converge to this point, and the question having been entirely settled that there can and will be no other bridge across the Schuylkill between the upper and lower ferry bridges—it has the uncommon advantage of being the **ONLY SITE** for a bridge between these two points.

If then it was worth \$ 40,000 in the year 1800, it is worth, under

all these concurring circumstances, at least four times that sum, or \$160,000, which would certainly more than compensate for any "depreciation in value" in the bridge, "occasioned by the waste of time," and thus far overrun the original cost of the structure and the site, if the construction of the committee were agreed to.

But the address is not content with its own mode of valuation, but it professes to ascertain the cost of constructing this bridge by the cost of erecting a similar bridge a few hundred feet above it.

Now the estimate of the cost of erecting a bridge at Arch or Race streets, will not furnish the cost of constructing a bridge at Market street, with any more accuracy than the estimate of the cost of a bridge at the Falls of Schuylkill would ascertain the actual cost of constructing a bridge at Race street.

The community has however placed an insuperable difficulty in the way of such a calculation, for it has determined that no bridge whatever shall be erected on these spots.

Then as to the estimates. —

1. There is the estimate of Canvass White, \$ 63,500
2. The estimate by Messrs. Robinson, Wilson and Hopkins, for a bridge at Fair Mount, 55,900

And upon these two estimates the committee assume that a bridge at Race street, will cost not \$ 55,900, nor \$ 63,500, but \$ 100,000

If these estimates are to be the guide, why not say at once it will cost \$ 55,900, or at the most \$ 63,500? So large an allowance shows an entire want of reliance on the part of the committee on the data furnished by themselves.

The annual expenses of lighting, watching, wear and tear, &c., are then assumed to be \$ 2,500, or one-half of the actual expenditure, and it is then asserted that the whole annual charge of such a bridge is only \$ 7,500, and of course it is intended to be inferred that the sum of \$ 100,000, *or one-third part of its actual cost, and also of its actual value*, will free the Schuylkill Permanent Bridge, and that \$ 2,500 will be the annual cost of repairing, sustaining, and maintaining the present structure forever.

In order, however, to ascertain how far mere estimates are to be depended upon, it will be expedient to compare them with each other. The estimate for a bridge at Arch street, by Canvass

White, was	\$ 63,500 00
------------	--------------

The estimate for a bridge at Race street, by Major Douglass,	\$ 130,372 00
--	---------------

The estimate for a bridge at Race street, by Mr. Erdman, on one plan,	\$ 139,602 00
---	---------------

And on another,	\$ 241,887 50
-----------------	---------------

The estimate for a bridge at Fair Mount, by Messrs. Robinson, Wilson and Hopkins, was	\$ 55,900 00
---	--------------

The estimate for a bridge at Fair Mount, by Major Douglass,	\$ 83,727 28
---	--------------

The estimate for a bridge at Peters's Island, by Major Wilson, was	\$ 50,391 04
--	--------------

The estimate for a bridge at Peters's Island, by Major Douglass,	\$ 75,991 98
--	--------------

And yet the actual cost of this last bridge, when completed, will certainly equal if not exceed the two estimates of Majors Wilson and Douglass added together, and the Schuylkill Permanent Bridge cost (independent of its site,) \$ 260,000.

So much then for *estimates*—and yet grounding their assertion on this imaginary sum of \$ 100,000, the Committee say, “Thus \$ 12,935 per annum would be saved to the community if the bridge were made free,” forgetting entirely that the *present* value of the site of the bridge is also to be paid for, and that the public are more likely to be better satisfied with the sober reality of actual experience, than the dim and uncertain fancies of visionary speculation.

But, says the address, “the public pay to this company eight per cent., when they can borrow at five the sum necessary to meet the appraisement required by law to render this bridge free.” “Shall the Commonwealth pay to a company eight per cent. for their money?”

Now it is perfectly clear that neither the commonwealth nor the public pay the 8 per cent. in any shape, for none contribute towards the support of the bridge except those who actually use it, and even they do not pay 8 per cent. on the value of the bridge, which is the rate at which the state must take it if it intends to free it agreeably to the charter.

The 8 per cent. is divided by the company on the capital stock, which is only \$ 195,650.

If the bridge were freed at its cost or value, \$ 300,000,

The interest to be paid by the state on this sum at 5 per cent. would be	\$ 15,000
--	-----------

And as no tolls could be levied, we must add the annual expenses of maintaining the bridge,	5,000
---	-------

Total,	<u>\$ 20,000</u>
--------	------------------

which would be the interest of \$ 400,000, and is the saving exchange proposed by the committee of paying an interest of 5 per cent. on \$ 400,000 instead of 8 per cent. on \$ 195,650.

As the company never valued their bridge by the price of their stock, they cannot with justice be accused of omitting even inadvertently their lots adjoining the site of it—and as these lots are not considered even by the committee of the town meeting in their construction of the charter, as any part of the structure or site, they might be omitted with great propriety in any calculation made to ascertain the real value of the bridge.

On the south side of the site of the bridge, the company have two

lots, one on each bank of the river, and each of them 100 feet front only on the Schuylkill. That on the west side extends in depth only to the end of the western wing wall of the bridge, and therefore has no front on Market street, and the other lot on the east side of the river has on it the dwellings of the toll collectors.

These open lots have always been regarded by the company as necessary to prevent the erection of buildings too near to the superstructure of the bridge, and to enable the company, in case of accident to the structure itself, to extend a temporary floating bridge across the river in such a manner as to preserve the uninterrupted passage of the Schuylkill, and at the same time not to interfere with the rebuilding of the bridge itself on its original site.

The City of Philadelphia own the ground on the north of the site on both sides of the river, and their well known character has always prevented the slightest apprehension of the erection of any buildings on their property near enough to endanger this valuable structure by fire or otherwise.

The imaginary and excessive valuation of these lots, so studiously exhibited in the address, has nothing to do with the real question under discussion, which is simply the real value of the structure and of the site of it as purchased from the city in the year 1800.

The committee have however made an error in dimension and value, which is too glaring to be passed over without remark.

They estimate the value of the lot on the city side at \$1800 per annum.	
They then say, "on the western side 462 feet, which would <i>probably</i>	
be worth, were the bridge free, six dollars per annum,	\$ 2772
And on Market street continued on the same side of the	
river 775 feet, estimated at per annum,	3100"

\$5872

Now the lot on the western side is only 100 feet, and not 462 feet in front on the river, and its front on the north is on the bridge site, and extends only to the end of the western wing wall, and is in length only 400 feet, instead of 775 feet, as represented by the committee.

The result is, that a lot in the township of Blockley, 100 feet front on the Schuylkill by 400 feet in depth, with a pleasant view to the north, of a long abutment and wing wall, is or will be worth \$5872 *per annum*, whilst the lot on the opposite side of the stream, in the City of Philadelphia proper, with the same front of 100 feet on the river and a much greater depth and a real front on Market street, for part of the distance, is or will be worth only \$1800 per annum!!!!

This mistake and its consequences are too obvious to need further remark.

The address then proceeds to show in other instances, the increased value that will be added to the lands on the west Bank of the Schuylkill by declaring this a free bridge.

The instances selected, are the Alms House, and the property of the City of Philadelphia on the north side of the Lancaster turnpike road

—There are, however, other owners of real estate on the west bank of the river, whose names are not mentioned in the address, and as it is right that a full view of the whole subject should be presented to the public to enable them to form a correct judgment, they will be mentioned in their order, with the number of front feet on the river belonging to each.

The list begins at Fairmount Dam, and extends to the Gray's Ferry Bridge.

1. Adam Everly, at and below the dam, about	-	-	1000 feet.
2. R. Harding,	-	-	900
3. Estate of Bingham and Baring,	-	-	1,300
4. Powelton, the seat of John Hare Powel Esquire,	-	-	1,150
Below the Permanent Bridge,			
5. Gardner's estate,	-	-	310
6. Mr. Keene,	-	-	120
7. Dr. Parrish,	-	-	120
8. John Price Wetherill,	-	-	500
9. E. S. Burd, J. H. Powel, and R. Hare,	-	-	1,200
10. Wood-lands, T. Mitchell,	-	-	2,200
11. Jones and Mayland,	-	-	175
12. Gray's estate,	-	-	650

Now it is clear as the noon-day sun, that if this favourite measure of the west Bank of the Schuylkill, will enhance the value of the Alms House and City property, it will in an equal, if not greater degree, raise the price of the property of the individual landholders, who will be more disposed to take advantage of so fortunate a circumstance; and it is worthy of remark, that the whole of the western front of the Schuylkill, from Fairmount Dam to Gray's Ferry Bridge—in length $2\frac{3}{4}$ miles, is (exclusive of the Alms House, City and Bridge property,) divided only into 12 estates or portions, and these are owned by a very small number of individuals, some of whom are gentlemen of very large private fortunes.

The address is therefore in fact pleading the cause of the large property holders on the west bank of the Schuylkill, when it urges the increased value of the Alms House farm and of the city lot as a reason why the city and adjoining districts should free this bridge at their own expense.

The corporation of “the guardians for the relief and employment of the poor of the city of Philadelphia, the district of Southwark, and the townships of the Northern Liberties and Penn,” comprises the city, the district of Spring Garden, and Penn township, the incorporated district of the Northern Liberties, the district of Kensington, the unincorporated part of the Northern Liberties, and the district of Southwark, a very large extent of territory, entirely situated to the east of the Schuylkill, and presenting extensive wharf fronts on that river, and also on the Delaware.

Under an act passed March 5th, 1828, this corporation became the owners of a farm of one hundred and eighty acres on the west side of the Schuylkill, as a site for the erection of buildings suitable for a hospital, alms house, house of employment, and children's asylum.

These buildings are now in a state of forwardness, and the whole, when completed, will not cost less than *one million of dollars*, having been planned and executed upon a scale calculated not for the duration of years, but of centuries.

The poor are to be placed on this farm, and the able bodied are to contribute to their own support by voluntary, and if necessary by compulsory labour, either at trades, mechanic arts, manufactures, agriculture, or other pursuits, so as to reimburse the expenses incurred on their account. The pernicious system of out door relief, which encourages fraud and idleness, may then be entirely discontinued, and the real objects of charity will be secured a comfortable abode, and be provided with the means of honest labour. This extensive and liberal plan required some spot beyond the limits of a populous city, sufficiently large to accommodate the buildings, and to admit of agricultural pursuits on a considerable scale, and at the same time, to exclude the evils of an unrestrained intercourse by its inmates, with persons unconnected with the establishment itself.

With these views, this farm, bounded on the east by the Schuylkill, and situated at some distance below the Permanent Bridge, was selected. Its position, on a navigable river, affords an easy transportation by water of coal, stone, wood, corn, wheat, and produce of every description, and at the same time secures it from too free a communication with the city and districts.

This farm was purchased as a permanent site, and not for the purposes of speculation, and this benevolent scheme for the relief and employment of the poor, requires not only every acre, but every foot of this ground for the purposes of this noble institution.

It is not the interest, therefore, of the city, districts, and townships composing the Corporation of the Guardians of the Poor, to expend \$300,000 of their own money to free this bridge, besides incurring an annual charge of \$5,000, in order to save one or two hundred dollars in the shape of tolls, and to raise the value of an establishment, they cannot, ought not, and will not sell.

It is still less the interest of the city of Philadelphia to reduce the value of their wharves and property within their own limits, and to add another large item to their debt of \$2,110,600, by a project to raise the value of their fifteen acres in the township of Blockley.

The whole scope of the argument of the address, is to prove the increased value the freeing this bridge will give to the property on the west of the Schuylkill, by having places of deposit formed on that shore, so that all commodities of a coarser kind, instead of being landed directly within the city and districts, shall be first deposited without their limits, and then hauled across a bridge at an increased cost of transportation.

The address, therefore, answers its own question, by showing it is not the interest of the city and county that this bridge should be freed for the private advantage of the individual holders of property on the other side of the Schuylkill.

The Committee of the town meeting, however, in a spirit of virtuous and most patriotic indignation, say—

“The spirit of our institutions would not be violated by the existence of a corporate body, who exercise their extraordinary powers within the bounds of the city, who close the great avenue to the metropolis of the state at their will, who make by-laws which operate as statutes, whose toll collectors can seize their fellow-citizens as malefactors, by their simple fiat, declaring disobedience to their mandate, injury to their property, resistance to their search—a penal offence.” “Is it not disgraceful to the metropolis of this great state, that every stranger who enters from the west is subjected to a tax, and may be seized as a felon ‘without warrant,’ if he be in a carriage of burthen and resists a search”—and this is magnificently printed in capitals, or italicized, to mark the serious outrages which the community have so quietly and calmly endured during the last twenty-nine years.

What is the real meaning of this most extraordinary description of the difficulty of getting *into Philadelphia* across the Market street bridge, it being acknowledged that the company are exceedingly polite and courteous to all those who leave the city by this “great avenue?”

It is that those who use the bridge, must, as in the case of the upper and lower ferry and other bridges, turnpikes, and canals, pay a moderate toll, and that as there are exemptions from toll or increase of it, according to the true state of the lading of carriages of burthen, an examination of the lading in some instances becomes necessary, which if refused, subjects the driver to a fine or penalty of thirty dollars, being the amount fixed by the act of Assembly.

The position of the committee is in fact that every bridge, turnpike road, and canal, should be freed at the expense of the state, and if carried out to its full length, would demand that strangers should not only travel toll free in Pennsylvania, but should pay neither board nor hackhire, whilst they remained within the limits of the city of Philadelphia.

The very reverse of this position is correct, for it is contrary to the spirit of our republican institutions to make the many pay for the benefit of the few, and to oblige the whole people of a great state to contribute to the support of a mere local improvement, in order to relieve those who use it daily, and to whom it is a matter of great personal advantage and benefit.

A brief statement of the provisions of the acts of assembly and by-laws will however place this matter in a point of view which must be perfectly satisfactory to every reasonable mind.

By the 16th section of the act of 16th March, 1798, it is enacted, “That if any person or persons shall wilfully, or without the orders of the said President and Directors, pull down, break or destroy, with intent to injure, any part or parts of the said bridge, or of any abutment, pier or piers, or of any of the toll houses, gates, bars, or other property of the said corporation, appurtenant to or erected or made for the use and convenience of the said bridge, or the persons employed in conducting the business thereof, or shall wilfully, without the orders and consent of the said corporation, or any person or persons authorized by them, obliterate, deface or destroy the letters, figures or other characters, in any written or printed list of the rates or tolls

affixed or to be affixed in any place or places, for the information of passengers and others, or who shall wilfully and maliciously obstruct or impede the passage on or over the said bridge, or any part or parts thereof, he, she or they, so offending, shall, and each of them shall forfeit and pay to the said President, Directors and Company, the sum of thirty dollars, to be sued for and recovered before any Justice of the peace in like manner, and subject to the same rules and regulations, as debts under twenty pounds may be sued for and recovered; and he, she or they, so offending, may and shall remain liable to actions at the suit of the said President, Directors and Company, for further damages for such torts, if the said sum or sums herein mentioned be not sufficient to repair and satisfy such damages."

This section imposes for each of these different offences a penalty of thirty dollars, to be recovered before a justice, and if greater damages are sustained than the sum of thirty dollars would be sufficient to repair and satisfy, leaving the offender liable to action at the suit of the company.

The legislature, however, deeming the public welfare to require additional provisions, passed a supplement to this act on the 2d April, 1821, by the 1st and 2d sections of which it is enacted, "That the President, Directors and Company for erecting a permanent bridge over the river Schuylkill, at or near the city of Philadelphia, be, and they are hereby authorized to regulate the mode of passage over the bridge, so as to prevent injury thereto, or annoyance to passengers by any person or persons who shall drive, ride or pass on, or over the same, and in any manner infringe the regulations made by the said President, Directors and Company as to such mode of passage, or in relation to the tonnage or weight permitted or forbidden to be transported on or over the said bridge; or as to the state of carriages of pleasure or burthen, claiming diminution or liable to increase of tolls, and generally to make and ordain such by-laws and regulations not contrary to the constitution and laws of this Commonwealth, *as shall be considered necessary for the orderly collection of the tolls, and the government, convenience, and preservation of the said bridge, its affairs and appurtenances, and for the ease and safety of passengers on and over the same*; and all breaches of such by-laws, rules and regulations, *shall be subject to the like penalty and penalties prescribed for the cases enumerated in the act to which this is a supplement*, to be sued for and recovered before any Justice of the Peace of the county, or Alderman of the city of Philadelphia, in like manner with the penalties, mentioned in the original act; and offenders are to remain liable to actions at the suit of the said President, Directors and Company for the damages as mentioned in the said act, in regard to those liable to the penalties in the said act prescribed; and any Justice of the Peace in and for the county, or Alderman of the city of Philadelphia, is authorized to take cognizance of any of the offences herein mentioned, or of any breaches of the peace, trespasses, crimes, or misdemeanors committed on the said bridge or its appurtenances; and the respective courts of the city or county of Philadelphia shall have jurisdiction of such offences or misdemeanors, in like manner and extent as of such

or any breaches of the peace, crimes, trespasses, or misdemeanors committed in the body of the said city or county, and properly falling within the jurisdiction and cognizance of such courts, without regard, in these instances, to the place of their being committed, whether within the reputed or fixed boundaries of the said city or county.

“SEC. II. That any constable or constables of the city or county aforesaid, shall have full power and authority to arrest, without warrant, all and every offender and offenders against the rules and regulations legally established for the government and direction of the affairs of the bridge, and the safety and convenience of passengers and transportation on and over the same, and carry such offender or offenders before a Justice of the Peace of the county, or the Mayor or any Alderman of the city of Philadelphia, to be dealt with according to law.”

These additional powers were then given to regulate the mode of passage over the bridge, so as to prevent injury thereto or annoyance to passengers, and to prevent infractions of the regulations made by the company in relation to weights permitted or forbidden to be transported over said bridge, and also as to the state of carriages of pleasure or burthen claiming diminution or liable to increase of tolls, for the orderly collection of the tolls, and the government, convenience, and preservation of the said bridge, its affairs and appurtenances, and for the ease and safety of passengers on and over the same.

All offences against such rules and regulations so made are punishable in the manner pointed out in the 16th section of the act of 1798, which imposes a penalty or fine of thirty dollars as before stated, and leaves the remedy of the company for the damages exceeding the said sum of thirty dollars to be used or not at their discretion.

As the bridge extends across the Schuylkill, and connects the city and county of Philadelphia, and difficult questions of jurisdiction might arise, the legislature wisely gave a concurrent jurisdiction to the Aldermen of the city and the Justices of the county, and also to the Courts of the city and county, not only of suits for the penalties of thirty dollars, but also of all “breaches of the peace, trespasses, crimes or misdemeanors committed on the said bridge or its appurtenances,” and the constables of the city or county are authorized without warrant to arrest and carry offenders against the rules for the government and direction of the affairs of the bridge, and the safety and convenience of passengers, before the Mayor, or any Alderman or Justice, to be dealt with according to law.

It is evident, that these enactments of the legislature are wise and salutary, and are intended by the speediness and certainty of the remedy for every offence connected with the preservation of the bridge and its passengers, and the orderly collection of the tolls, not so much to punish as to prevent offences; and this precaution has been fully justified by the successful and quiet effect of provisions which have never been enforced to the extent of the law.

In order to protect the people of the country, only “three fourths” of the tolls demandable in other cases can be taken for the transportation of “the produce of the country,” and for those laden with manure, *half toll*—and empty carriages of burthen pass for *half toll*, and to

secure the bridge against accidents, no weight can be transported across it greater than five tons, and the tolls are increased in proportion for carriages of burden laden with more than two tons.

To effect these purposes, and to prevent imposition, the 3d rule amongst others has been established by the company, agreeably to the above recited acts of Assembly, and is in the following words :—

“The toll collector or collectors shall decide on the exemptions from toll, or its increase, as mentioned in the toll list, according to the quantity of lading or its absence. Any driver of a carriage of burthen, refusing a search, or by any contrivance or means, obstructing or deterring from such search, by the toll collector, or misrepresenting the true state of his carriage, shall pay the penalty imposed on offences against these rules and regulations. Refusing to pay, or evading payment of toll, is to be considered a penal offence.”

No one will deny that every honest man would cheerfully comply with this necessary regulation, and at once convince the officer of the company that his representation of the state of his carriage was correct.

If however through obstinacy or dishonesty, the driver of a carriage of burthen will not submit to such an examination, or misrepresents the true state of his carriage, there is no authority vested in the collector to make any search, but the driver becomes instantly liable to the penalty affixed by law to a breach of the rules and regulations.

If he refuses to pay or evades payment of toll, he also commits an offence against the same, and is liable to a similar penalty.

All offences against the rules and regulations of the company, as established according to law, whether styled offences or penal offences, are only punishable by a fine or penalty of \$ 30, and this is made perfectly clear by the 15th rule, which is in the following words :—

“The *penalty* for each and every *offence* herein mentioned is declared and ordained to be thirty dollars, payable to the Treasurer for the use of the Bridge Company. But the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Bridge Committee, appointed by the President and Directors, may remit either in whole or in part, any penalty herein imposed, according to the circumstances of each particular case.”

An examination of the rules and regulations established according to law by this Bridge Company, will immediately satisfy every candid man, not only of their utility, but absolute necessity, to preserve the bridge, and to secure its passengers from annoyance or danger.

It is therefore distinctly stated, in contradiction to the unmeasured assertions and accusations of the address, that the spirit of our institutions is not violated but preserved by the existence of this Bridge Company, who exercise no extraordinary powers within the bounds of the city, and who have neither the power nor the disposition to close this great avenue to the metropolis of the state at their will, but who at all times and seasons, since the first opening of this bridge twenty-nine years ago, have furnished to their fellow-citizens a free, easy and uninterrupted passage across the Schuylkill.

That they neither can nor do make by-laws which operate as statutes,

that their toll collectors possess no power whatever to seize their fellow-citizens, nor have the company by any act or regulation attempted to inflict any other fine or penalty, than the penalty of 30 dollars, imposed by the acts of Assembly, from which they derive their existence and their franchises, and which is collected by a suit in the usual form before a magistrate, nor can any person be seized as a *felon* for any infraction, however great, of the by-laws.

But if persons will drive or ride over the bridge, in a trot or gallop, or at speed, or will attempt to pass, or violently or unnecessarily to urge or force on a preceding carriage—or will by riotous and disorderly conduct—vociferations, alarming cries or sounds, or other improper behaviour, annoy passengers in carriages or on horseback, or terrify horses, cattle, or other animals passing the bridge, or will smoke segars, or carry fire over the bridge, or will discharge guns or firearms on the bridge, they become liable to the same penalty of 30 dollars, and they may as in other cases of infractions of the by-laws, be arrested by a constable, (and not by a collector) without warrant, and carried before the proper authority, to be dealt with according to law.

So important indeed has the legislature thought it to guard the wooden bridges within this commonwealth, that by two public acts passed 19th March 1824, and 23d April 1829, they have made a variety of useful but severe regulations for their preservation.

The Permanent Bridge Company have, however, always regarded all these different provisions, regulations, and fines, as affording the means of prevention and not of punishment, and during their long course of experience, although situated in the midst of a crowded population, have never found it necessary to collect the penalties provided by law.

The stockholders, as stated by the Committee of the Bridge Company in their answers to Councils, are in number “two hundred and thirty-five, of whom ninety-nine are widows, single women, orphans, and charitable institutions,” and it is asked in the address, “are the present stockholders prepared to refund to the original subscribers or their representatives, the increased value of their stock?”

To this there is a simple and easy answer; some are original stockholders, and those who are not, paid the full market price of the day to those from whom they bought.

The same question might be asked with greater propriety of those landholders on the west bank of the Schuylkill, who are in favour of freeing this bridge. If this bridge is freed, will you refund to those persons from whom you or your ancestors purchased, the increased value of your land, or will you now refund to the Commonwealth the difference between what was paid for your land and its present value?

When these gentlemen have made out a statement of their accounts, it will be then time enough for the stockholders of the Bridge Company to think of furnishing the required information.

A strong reason urged in favour of freeing this bridge, is that William Cobbett, then an inhabitant of Philadelphia, and now a member

of the reformed house of commons, was one of the original subscribers to the stock of this company. Mr. Cobbett's interest as a stockholder, terminated on the 24th December 1806.

The last, and it is supposed the strongest reason in the view of the Committee, as it is printed in large capitals, in favour of this proposition, is the case of Witmer's bridge, the history of which does not appear to have been clearly understood.

By an act passed the 22d September 1787, Abraham Witmer was authorized to build a bridge across the *Conestogoe Creek*, on the great road leading from the city of Philadelphia to the borough of Lancaster, and he was obliged by the third section of this law to leave open and free a passage of twenty feet wide on said road on the north side and at both ends of said bridge.

By a supplement to this act, passed 4th April, 1798, it appears that Mr. Witmer had represented to the legislature that his bridge had been built without a view to the making of the Philadelphia and Lancaster turnpike road, and was not constructed of materials sufficiently durable, nor calculated to sustain the heavy burthens which were daily passing, and he was accordingly authorized to build and maintain a permanent bridge across the *Conestogoe Creek*, immediately above and on the north side of his then bridge. It being however expressly provided, "that the said Abraham Witmer, his heirs and assigns, shall and will as soon as the new bridge is completed, remove the old bridge and leave a passage of twenty feet on the said road, on the south side of the said new bridge, and at both ends thereof, for the use of all those who may think proper to pass and repass the said *creek*, without going over the said bridge."

The object of this and the similar provision in the first law, was to allow all persons to ford the creek toll free, who did not choose to use the bridge.

In this act, and in the one to which it was a supplement, there was a provision, by which the legislature, by a law enacted for that purpose, was authorized to declare it a free bridge, and three commissioners were to be appointed by the legislature on the part of the commonwealth, and three by Mr. Witmer, any four or more of whom were to estimate what sum he should be entitled to receive for his right and title to said bridge, which sum so estimated should be paid to him out of the treasury of the commonwealth.

The bridge erected in pursuance of this law, was of stone, and uncovered, and cost \$10,000, but the road or passage across the creek, directed to be left open on the south side of the bridge, was not made agreeably to the act of Assembly, until the beginning of the year 1811.

By an act passed the 2d April 1811, the legislature relinquished to the commissioners of Lancaster County, a debt or sum of \$10,418 34, "for the purpose of purchasing and making free the bridge built by Abraham Witmer, over the *Conestoga creek*, in the said county."

Mr. Witmer, however, refused to deal with the commissioners of Lancaster county in any way respecting the said bridge. But on the

14th January 1812, he presented a petition to the legislature, stating that under the authority of an act of the legislature, passed April 4th 1798, he erected a valuable permanent stone bridge over the Conestoga river near Lancaster, and that he is now willing to choose three commissioners on his part, in pursuance of the third section of the said act, provided the legislature will pass a law for the appointment of three commissioners on the part of the commonwealth, to estimate the value of the said property : that on his receiving a compensation he will surrender it to the public as a free bridge.

On the 27th March 1812, an act was passed, "to purchase and make free the bridge over the River Conestogoe, built by Abraham Witmer, in the county of Lancaster."

Agreeably to the provisions of this act, Abraham Witmer named his three commissioners, who met the three commissioners appointed by the legislature. These commissioners made an award that the sum of \$58,444 44 should be paid to Abraham Witmer. The commissioners of Lancaster county refused to draw an order on the treasurer of the county for this sum, and the matter became the subject of litigation, and the bridge remained a toll bridge until the year 1827, when it was purchased by the county commissioners, of the representatives of Abraham Witmer, for \$28,000, and a deed conveying the property to the county of Lancaster executed, immediately after which toll ceased to be taken.

This bridge, thus made free, was erected in 1798, and not in 1787, over the Conestogoe creek, and the contract entered into with the legislature was different from that of the Schuylkill Permanent Bridge Company. The legislature, in 1812, did not pass a law in opposition to the will of Mr. Witmer, compelling him to sell his bridge, for he testified his willingness to take compensation for it, before its passage, and after it became a law acquiesced in all its provisions, by appointing his three commissioners, and demanding the amount of the award made in his favour.

The claims of Mr. Witmer as a public benefactor are not alleged to be greater than those of this bridge company, and they no doubt would be satisfied to be paid for their bridge, according to the rate that either the sum awarded by the commissioners, or the sum received by Mr. Witmer's representatives, bore to the original cost of the bridge across the Conestogoe.

The result would be, in this precisely similar case, to pay the Permanent Bridge Company for their bridge either the sum of \$1,753,333 20, or at the least of \$840,000.

In conclusion, the address uses the following language, which has been already quoted. "The committee but ask the legislature to cause this bridge to be appraised in conformity with the law, and they trust that the upper and lower bridges will be made free."

The petitions presented under this request of the committee, conclude thus, "your petitioners pray that your honourable bodies will pass an act as in the case of Witmer's bridge, appointing commissioners to appraise the Market Street Schuylkill Permanent Bridge, in strict

accordance with the charter, in order that the parties who are interested may ascertain the sum to be paid, and adopt measures to make it, as well as the Schuylkill Upper Bridge, free."

The language of the committee and of the petitions, therefore, shows that the act prayed for is to appraise the bridge only, agreeably to the design of Mr. Heston's resolution, which was so completely disposed of by the senate, in April 1832. Either the committee have not read and understood the act of 1798, or if they have, they are unwilling to present openly to the legislature, the only request that can be made consistent with the provisions of the charter—**TO MAKE THIS A FREE BRIDGE AT THE EXPENSE OF THE STATE.**

They have not and they will not present the question at Harrisburg in this plain and undisguised form.

They ask the legislature to appraise this bridge, in order that the parties who are interested may ascertain the sum to be paid. In what part of the charter is such a power or reservation contained? It would be certainly quite as reasonable to ask the legislature to appraise the Woodlands or Powelton, in order that the parties who are interested may ascertain the sum to be paid.

And the next step is to "adopt measures to make it, as well as the Schuylkill Upper Bridge, free"—that is, for the satisfaction of the owners of property on the west bank of the Schuylkill, the legislature is to have one bridge appraised, in order that they may think of some means of purchasing two bridges, or as the committee would have it, three bridges.

THIS PROPOSITION WILL HARDLY BEAR EVEN THE STATEMENT, AND SHOWS BUT TOO EVIDENTLY THAT THOSE WHO ARE MOST DESIROUS OF HAVING THE MARKET STREET BRIDGE A FREE ONE, ARE BOTH UNWILLING AND AFRAID TO ASK THE LEGISLATURE TO FREE ONE, MUCH LESS THREE BRIDGES, AT THE EXPENSE OF THE STATE, IN THE PRESENT STATE OF ITS DEBT, TAXATION, AND FINANCES.

If, however, either or all of these three bridges are to be made free, it is but natural to inquire at whose expense this object is to be effected.

Will the county, districts, city or state furnish the necessary means?

THE COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA.

The county of Philadelphia were indebted, on the 1st	
of January, 1834, for loans,	\$251,300 00
And for outstanding orders, claims and damages	
awarded,	225,100 32
	<hr/>
Making a total debt of	\$476,400 32
	<hr/>

The taxes of the county, including the state tax, were for 1833, 60 cents in the 100 dollars on real estate, being the maximum of taxation which the inhabitants of the county would bear.

This percentage produced the sum of	\$267,439 66
	<hr/>

The county, therefore, instead of taking upon itself any additional burthens, requires speedy and effectual relief, and will need the aid of legislative enactment to enable it to meet even its present engagements. *The county therefore cannot and will not free all or any of these bridges.*

THE DISTRICTS.

The following statement of the debts and taxes of the incorporated districts on the north and south of the city, demonstrates most unequivocally that they cannot and will not free all or any of these bridges. Their interests are also directly hostile to the present plan of freeing the Market Street Bridge alone, which, by destroying the Upper and Lower Ferry Bridges, would at once bar all direct access into the upper or lower districts from the west of the Schuylkill.

The taxes are for 1833, and the debts are as they stood on the 1st of January, 1834.

DISTRICT OF SPRING GARDEN.

Loans, permanent,	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$140,000 00
Temporary,	-	-	-	-	-	-	32,553 99
							<hr/>
Total,	-	-					\$172,553 99

Taxes—Corporation, 80 cents—Lamp and watch, 20 cents—County and State, 60 cents—Poor, 34 cents. Total, \$1 94 in the \$100.

DISTRICT OF THE NORTHERN LIBERTIES.

Loans,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$137,000 00
Taxes—Corporation, 60 cents—County and State, 60 cents—Poor, 34 cents. Total,								\$1 54 in the \$100.

DISTRICT OF KENSINGTON.

Debts about - - - - - \$70,000 00
Taxes—Corporation, 75 cents—County and State, 60 cents—Poor,
34 cents. Total, \$1 69 in the \$100.

INCORPORATED TOWNSHIP OF MOYAMENSING.

Loans, temporary and permanent, - - - \$48,000 00
Taxes—Poor, 40 cents—Road, 40 cents—Lamp and watch, 40 cents
—Pump, 25 cents—Schuylkill water, 20 cents—County and State, 60
cents. Total, \$2 25 in the \$100.

DISTRICT OF SOUTHWARK.

Loans, - - - - - \$130,000 00
 Taxes—Corporation, 70 cents—County and State, 60 cents—Poor,
 34 cents. Total, \$1 64 in the \$100.

THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA.

The taxes for 1833 were, City, 75 cents—County and State, 60 cents
 —Poor, 34 cents. Total, \$1 69 in the \$100.

And these produced—

City,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$193,636 08
County and State,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	159,661 50
Poor,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	93,390 79

Making a total of	-	-	-	\$446,688 37
-------------------	---	---	---	--------------

paid in direct taxation by the citizens of the city of Philadelphia on their real estate—and the whole of this immense revenue (with the exception of the state tax of one mill in the dollar, amounting to \$43,592 57) was expended in the support of the government of the city and county, and of the corporation of the guardians of the poor.

The citizens of the city of Philadelphia have, however, besides this direct taxation, to contribute annually a very large sum in addition to the treasury of the state, from various sources. The following estimates are for 1833, and are taken either from the books of the county treasurer, or the auditor general's report, and when the accounts of the city are mixed in with the rest of the county, so as not to be capable of separation, it is assumed that under each head, the city contributes two-thirds, and the rest of the county the remaining one-third.

The city of Philadelphia, therefore, paid into the state treasury for the year 1833,

For Tavern licenses,	-	-	-	-	\$ 7,200 00
Tax on bank dividends,	-	-	-	-	16,770 92
Duties on dealers in foreign merchandise,	-	-	-	-	19,202 18
Collateral inheritances,	-	-	-	-	64,184 90
Tax on personal property,	-	-	-	-	12,261 65
Tax on offices,	-	-	-	-	8,059 32
Tax on writs, &c.,	-	-	-	-	3,574 62

\$ 131,253 59

To which add the above amount of taxation,

446,688 37

And it gives the very large sum of

\$ 577,941 96

RAISED ANNUALLY OUT OF A POPULATION OF A LITTLE MORE THAN EIGHTY THOUSAND SOULS, AND LIVING WITHIN THE NARROW COMPASS OF TWO SQUARE MILES.

If the auction commissions and duties, which are almost entirely paid in the city of Philadelphia, were added to this sum, it would make another item of at least \$ 90,000.

But in addition to this immense load of taxation, the city suffers the pressure of a very heavy debt, which is composed of

1. The debt of the city itself, - - - \$ 2,110,600 00

The annual interest of which is \$ 110,231.

2. Its proportion of the county debt of \$ 476,400 32, say 284,000 00

3. Its proportion of the funded debt of the guardians of
the poor, of \$ 650,000, say 438,043 00

Making a grand total of real city debt, of \$ 2,832,643 00

THUS LABOURING UNDER AN ALMOST OVERWHELMING AMOUNT OF DEBT AND TAXATION, IT CAN CREATE NO SURPRISE THAT THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA HAS POSITIVELY REFUSED AT ITS OWN EXPENSE TO FREE THE SCHUYLKILL PERMANENT BRIDGE, MUCH LESS TO PURCHASE THE UPPER AND LOWER FERRY BRIDGES FOR A SIMILAR PURPOSE.

It is therefore absolutely certain that the city, county, and districts cannot and will not, either at their joint or separate expense, free all or any of these bridges, and this determination is formed, without entering into the good or bad policy of such a measure, in regard to their respective interests.

These bodies have not, however, by the acts of Assembly, from which they derive their existence and authorities, any power whatever to purchase or make free these or any other bridges within the commonwealth.

It is so obviously not the interest of those living between the two rivers, to make any of these bridges free, and thus raise the price of vacant lots on the west bank of the Schuylkill, and of course depress the value of their own, that it is only necessary to state the fact, to show that neither they nor their representatives ever will contribute their aid to carry into effect so unwise a scheme.

These debts may be grouped thus—

City of Philadelphia,	-	-	-	\$ 2,110,600 00
County of Philadelphia,	-	-	-	476,400 32
Guardians of the poor,	-	-	-	650,000 00
District of Spring Garden,	-	-	-	172,553 99
District of Northern Liberties,	-	-	-	137,000 00
District of Kensington,	-	-	-	70,000 00
Township of Moyamensing,	-	-	-	48,000 00
District of Southwark,	-	-	-	130,000 00
Total,				\$ 3,794,554 31

Being nearly one-eleventh of the assessed value of all the real estate in the city and county of Philadelphia.

All hope, therefore, being entirely cut off, of the Schuylkill Permanent Bridge, or any other bridge, being freed at the expense of the city, county, or districts, we can then only turn to the

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,

to whom is reserved by the charter the right of freeing this bridge at its own expense, upon the payment of its full value, and providing a permanent fund for keeping it in repair for ever.

The State of Pennsylvania, on the 30th November,

1824, owed - - - - - \$1,840,823 73½

And on the 30th November, 1833, the same state

owed (including the remainder of the loan per act of 16th February, 1833, not then paid into the treasury) the sum of - - - - - 21,527,786 32

Showing an annual increase of debt since 1824, of 2,187,440 28½

And a total increase of debt, in the short space of

nine years, of - - - - - 19,686,962 58½

The completion and the necessary extension of the canals and rail roads of the state, the improvement of the interior by bridges and turnpikes, the support of colleges, academies, and other useful institutions, the improvement and enlargement of penitentiaries and prisons, and the establishment and maintenance of a general system of education, agreeably to the solemn injunction of the constitution, will necessarily cause a corresponding increase of the state debt for several years to come.

If these anticipations, founded upon past experience, and upon a knowledge of our future wants, are correct, (and there can be no reasonable doubt of their accuracy,) the State of Pennsylvania will owe, on the 30th November 1837, upwards of THIRTY MILLIONS OF DOLLARS.

Will or can the State of Pennsylvania be justified in adding to this necessary burden upon the industry of her people, by freeing one or more mere local works, which are now supported in a manner entirely unfelt by the community?

If the state were to free the Schuylkill Permanent Bridge at Market Street, it would be obliged, in common justice to the populous districts of the county, to purchase and make free the Gray's Ferry and Upper Ferry Bridges, both of which present very advantageous modes of access at present from the country on the west of the Schuylkill.

The Schuylkill Permanent Bridge will cost, to free it,

at least - - - - - \$300,000 00

And the purchase of the two other bridges, which from

circumstances already stated, are erected on the only

two remaining sites below the Fair Mount Dam, would

demand, certainly, - - - - - 300,000 00

more, making a total of - - - - - \$600,000 00

to be added to the state debt, besides requiring at least \$10,000 per

annum to be raised by the commonwealth, to maintain and keep these three bridges in repair for ever.

The LEGISLATURE, therefore, in answer to the request of THE SELECT AND COMMON COUNCILS OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, that this bridge should be made free at the expense of the state, may, without any "IMPROPRIETY," reply, that "THE SUM REQUIRED FOR THAT PURPOSE WOULD BE TOO LARGE TO BE TAKEN FROM THE FUNDS OF THE 'COMMONWEALTH,' IN THE PRESENT STATE OF THE FINANCES."

But the great interests of the State of Pennsylvania demand that neither this bridge, nor any other bridge across the Schuylkill below the line of the Pennsylvania rail road, should be made toll free; for the inevitable consequence must be, the vital injury or total destruction of their own bridge just erected at Peters's Island at a very heavy expense, "the tolls to be charged for passing upon which" are by law to be "fixed by the canal commissioners."

If these bridges are freed, then all the bridges and turnpike roads throughout the state are entitled to the same favour, and the state canals and rail roads, instead of affording a revenue for their support, and creating a fund finally for the redemption of the immense state debt necessarily contracted for their erection, must be maintained, repaired, and extended, and the interest of our debt paid, by an increased direct taxation of every description of property, in order that those who use and profit by them may pass toll free.

This is not and never will be the policy of the industrious and intelligent people of the great and growing State of Pennsylvania.

The true interests of the community demand that the Schuylkill Permanent Bridge should not be freed at this time. The tolls are the same as originally fixed by law, and are lower than those of any other bridge in the United States. To protect the people of the country, only "*three-fourths*" of the toll demandable in other cases can be taken for the transportation of the produce of the country. Carriages laden with manure pay *half toll*, and empty carriages of burthen pass for *half toll*. And these tolls are of course not levied on the state at large, nor taken out of the pockets of citizens who never pass it, but are paid by those whom this bridge accommodates and benefits—a most important consideration in a republican government.

The profits have never paid the stockholders 6 per cent. on their original investment. The passage of the bridge has never been stopped nor interrupted since its first opening in 1805, a period of twenty-nine years.

If destroyed by fire, flood, or other accident, it would be immediately rebuilt by the company at their own expense, and without resorting to the public treasury.

A covered wooden free bridge, commanding the principal entrance into a great city, would be an anomaly of very limited continuance, for a neglect for a short time of any of the necessary regulations for its preservation and support would soon destroy the superstructure,

and thus bar all access by this great avenue to the metropolis of the state.

It would certainly be more reasonable, in the present state of affairs, to look out for new sources of revenue, without burdening the community, than to seek for opportunities of unnecessarily and impolitically increasing the present debt of the commonwealth.

RATES OF TOLL,

According to Law, at the Schuylkill Permanent Bridge.

For every	Cents.
1. Foot passenger, - - - - -	1
2. Horse or mule, without rider or harness, (<i>halter excepted</i>)	1
3. The same, with rider, - - - - -	2
4. Head of horned cattle, not more than 20 to pass at one time,	1
5. Living sheep, swine, or calf, - - - - -	$\frac{1}{2}$

Carriages of Pleasure.

	Cents.
6. Four wheels, drawn by four horses, - - - - -	20
Additional horse, each, - - - - -	4
7. The same, drawn by two horses, - - - - -	12
8. The same, drawn by one horse, - - - - -	10
9. Two wheels, or sleigh, with two horses, - - - - -	10
Additional horse, - - - - -	4
10. The same, with one horse, - - - - -	6

Carriages of Burden.

	Cents.
11. Four wheels, drawn by four horses, loaded, - - - - -	17
Additional horse, each, - - - - -	4
Add, to the additional horses,	
If 3 tons, or above 2 tons, - - - - -	5
4 tons, or above 3, - - - - -	15
5 tons, or above 4, - - - - -	45
6 tons, or above 5, being the heaviest weight allowed to pass, - - - - -	135
12. The same, with produce of the country, wood and stone excepted, - - - - -	12 $\frac{1}{2}$
Additional horse, each, - - - - -	3
13. The same, with manure or empty, - - - - -	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
Additional horse, - - - - -	2
14. Four wheels, drawn by three horses, loaded, - - - - -	14
15. The same, with produce, except wood and stone, - - - - -	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
16. The same, with manure or empty, - - - - -	7
17. Four wheels, drawn by two horses, loaded, - - - - -	12
18. The same, with produce, except, &c. - - - - -	9
19. The same, with manure or empty, - - - - -	6

	Cents.
20. Two wheels, or sled, drawn by two horses, loaded,	- 10
Additional horse, each,	- - - - - 4
21. The same, with produce, except, &c.	- - - - - 7½
Additional horse,	- - - - - 3
22. The same, with manure or empty,	- - - - - 5
Additional horse,	- - - - - 2
23. Two wheels, or sled, drawn by one horse, loaded,	- - - - - 6
24. The same, with produce, except, &c.	- - - - - 4½
25. The same, with manure or empty,	- - - - - 3
26. Oxen in draught, 2 estimated as equal to 1 horse.	
Sleds of heavy burden, to be estimated as four wheel carriages of like burden.	
Dearborne with one horse,	- - - - - 6¼

Rules, according to Law.

Persons, carriages, or cattle, of whatsoever description, *passing over the bridge*, will *keep to the right*. Offence against this rule, by obstructing the passage, will subject the *drivers of carriages to back out*, and *drivers of cattle to return*, and enter on the proper direction, under penalty of thirty dollars.

Carriages of heavy burden shall pay as loaded, which contain any thing more than feed for two days' journey.

Carriages of light burden shall pay as loaded, if not wholly empty.

Loading, if not wholly produce, is not entitled to diminution of toll. Loads of any description whatsoever, exceeding two tons, their weight shall be truly declared by the driver, previous to passing.

Injury done to any part whatsoever, of the property of the Bridge Company, will subject the offender to forfeiture and payment of thirty dollars, and of being liable to damages for further torts. Evasion of tolls is injury of property.

Published by order of the Board of Directors.

GEORGE RUNDLE, *Treasurer.*

Philadelphia, March 6, 1828.

TAXES OF THE COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA FOR 1833.

The county commissioners assessed a tax of 60 cents in the \$ 100, 10 of which is for the use of the state, amounting to \$ 267,439 66, to meet the expenditures of the year 1833; which was proportioned among the several districts, as follows:

City.

Upper Delaware Ward,	-	-	-	\$ 8,001 39	
North Mulberry do.	-	-	-	5,611 50	
Lower Delaware do.	-	-	-	10,186 05	
South Mulberry do.	-	-	-	7,652 82	
High street do.	-	-	-	19,818 33	
North do.	-	-	-	11,415 37	
Chestnut do.	-	-	-	19,820 07	
Middle do.	-	-	-	9,643 72	
Walnut do.	-	-	-	13,132 45	
South do.	-	-	-	11,157 07	
Dock do.	-	-	-	12,886 86	
Locust do.	-	-	-	11,216 64	
Pine do.	-	-	-	7,133 67	
New Market do.	-	-	-	6,743 78	
Cedar do.	-	-	-	5,241 78	
				<hr/>	\$ 159,661 50

Northern Liberties.

Northern Liberties, 1st Ward,	-	-		\$4,586 63	
Ditto, 2d do.	-	-		4,057 38	
Ditto, 3d do.	-	-		3,490 28	
Ditto, 4th do.	-	-		3,517 78	
Ditto, 5th do.	-	-		4,297 79	
Ditto, 6th do.	-	-		2,829 44	
Ditto, 7th do.	-	-		3,019 01	
Ditto, Unincorporated,	-	-		3,895 06	
				<hr/>	29,693 37
Spring Garden, 1st Ward,	-	-	-	\$7,477 67	
Ditto, 2d do.	-	-	-	5,136 32	
Ditto, 3d do.	-	-	-	3,039 27	
Penn Township,	-	-	-	5,425 33	
				<hr/>	21,078 59
East Kensington,	-	-	-	\$4,158 72	
West Kensington,	-	-	-	4,255 26	
				<hr/>	8,413 98
Roxborough,	-	-	-		2,933 15
Germantown,	-	-	-		4,579 07
Oxford,	-	-	-		3,495 72
Bristol,	-	-	-		2,069 58

Amount carried forward,

\$ 231,924 96

	Amount brought forward,	\$ 231,924 96
Byberry,	- - - - -	1,294 52
Moreland,	- - - - -	641 61
Lower Dublin,	- - - - -	2,860 65
BLOCKLEY,	- - - - -	4,992 17
Kingssessing,	- - - - -	1,840 49
Moyamensing,	- - - - -	5,241 98
Passyunk,	- - - - -	3,532 74
East Southwark,	- - - - -	\$8,408 47
West Southwark,	- - - - -	6,702 07
		<hr/> 15,110 54
		<hr/> \$ 267,439 66



